DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 927 SO 029 768

AUTHOR Brehm, Christine J.
TITLE Stereotypes, Tolerance, and the Classroom.
PUB DATE 1998-09-00
NOTE 34p.; Revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Boston, MA, September 3-6, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Comparative Analysis; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; Minority Groups; Questionnaires; *Stereotypes; *Student Attitudes; Student Surveys; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Tolerance

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests that because higher education is instrumental in increasing awareness and sensitivity toward minority images and can influence levels of tolerance that students display and convey to public actors; therefore, many universities offer classes that challenge students to look beyond stereotypes and to appreciate the diversity of foreign, minority, and gender groups. If these classes are capable of encouraging diversity, tolerance, and inclusion, then a measurable change in the level of tolerance and the stereotypes held by students taking these classes can be expected. Using pre- and post-class surveys, it was found that students who take one of the foreign/minority/gender classes to meet core curriculum requirements have no significant change in their stereotypes or in their tolerance levels toward women, minorities, and gays after taking the class, compared to their tolerances and images of these groups before taking such a class. (Contains 3 tables of data and 36 references. Appendix A contains cover letters for students and instructors and the questionnaire; Appendix B lists the various types of classes offered; Appendix C describes the research project.) (BT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 426 927

Stereotypes, Tolerance, and the Classroom

Christine J. Brehm
Political Science Department
Box 6317
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506-6317

Earlier version of paper presented as poster in the Teaching and Learning section of the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, Mass., September 3-6, 1998.

SO 029 768

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christine J. Brehm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- • Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Because higher education is instrumental in increasing awareness and sensitivity toward minority images, and can influence levels of tolerance students display and convey to public actors, many universities offer classes that challenge students to look beyond stereotypes and to appreciate the diversity of foreign, minority, and gender groups. If these classes are capable of encouraging diversity, tolerance, and inclusion, then we can expect a measurable change in the level of tolerance and the stereotypes held by students taking these classes. Using pre- and post-class surveys I found that students who take one of the foreign minority gender classes to meet core curriculum requirements have no significant change in their stereotypes or in their tolerance levels toward women, minorities, and gays after taking the class, compared to their tolerances and images of these groups before taking such a class.

Higher education is an important agent of political socialization, influencing those most likely to participate in our political system in some form or another. Stereotypes about minorities held by the general public influence public support for various social programs. The attitudes and tolerance one displays toward minorities is a reflection of one's dedication to democratic values. Campuses, as do other communities, seek to build inclusive, tolerant climates to accommodate their diversity of members. Many campuses offer classes that fulfil this requirement by having students take a foreign, minority, gender class. The question becomes: if a student completes this type of class, is there a measurable impact on this student? Is this student going to be more tolerant, have fewer stereotypes, or be less likely to engage in stereotyping?

Recent studies suggest that stereotypes about minorities held by the general public directly influence public support for various social programs and that the political elite[1] have some effect on the beliefs held by the general public. Martin Gilens (1995) found that the racial attitudes of white Americans affected their views toward welfare programs. "Race-blind" or "race-neutral" social programs fail to garner white American support not because there is a problem with the program but because white Americans who hold negative perceptions of Blacks (such as "lazy" or "lack work-ethic") also consider Blacks to be undeserving of such program benefits (Gilens 1995: 994-1014). Gilens (1996) also found similar results and noted that although the elite frame issues such as welfare and crime in race-neutral language, the mass public still view those issues in relation to their racial attitudes (593-604). Kinder and Mendelberg (1995) suggest that the attitudes and tolerance one displays toward minorities is a reflection of one's dedication to democratic values. The authors also note that the impact of prejudice from the mass public is dependent on how the elite frame the particular social issues (402-424).

Philip Converse (1964) looked at the political belief systems[2] of the elite and the general public and determined that the elite, with more sophisticated abilities, are able to understand abstract and complex political situations while the mass public is much less sophisticated and possesses only a general understanding of most political issues. Converse assumes less logical belief schemata are characteristic of the mass public because they will not "think about" political beliefs as often or as thoroughly as the elite. It is the elite who are capable of organized belief structures, it is the political elite who are capable of having some effect on the beliefs held by the general public (Converse 1964:209).

Following along this theoretical path set by Converse, as complex political belief systems are diffused from the elite to the general public, the ability to understand and utilize those beliefs quickly fades in the masses, thus different belief systems spring to life for each group. The

---

[1]Political elites are the President, Cabinet members, Senators and Representatives (both state and national), Supreme Court Justices, White House, executive branch and congressional staff, state legislative staff, political party and congressional campaign committee officials, lobbyists, members of city council and school boards, media personnel, political elites are those the general public look to for direction and governance. Note, most of those who attain elite positions today usually have some college education if not advanced degrees.

[2]Belief system is defined as a "configuration of ideas and attitudes in which the elements are bund together by some form of constraint or functional interdependence" (Converse 1964:207).

images central to the (numerical minority but powerful) elite in their systems of belief are not the same as the images central to the belief systems of the general public (a numerical majority). Differing belief systems would illustrate that there is no umbrella ideology drawing parts of society into a tidy whole. If we accept Converse's theory that there are two separate systems or levels of belief for the elite and the masses, then his work would support the idea that there has been fragmentation of the mass public into narrowly defined issue publics, and that many of the general population do not possess any particular issue focus at all (1964: 245-246).

In the Gilens studies (1995, 1996) and in the Kinder and Mendelberg study (1995) it is clear that although the elite form an issue as race-neutral, the mass public still see that issue as race-based, yet the studies also state that the elite are capable of influencing the impact of prejudice on social programs. With different levels and abilities of political concern between the elite and the mass public, how is it that decisions are made that are democratically representative of the American society? Kuklinski and Segura (1995) determine that "citizens use heuristics -- judgmental shortcuts -- to reach political decisions" (1995: 5). For example, a symbolic politics model, such as one posed by Sniderman (1992), is built on three factors. First, citizens have only a few pre-existing models (such as personal values based in ideology and prejudice) for weighing political decisions; second, the citizens are socialized to these models from childhood and the simple heuristics have been nurtured on through to adulthood; and finally, opinion on new policy issues is formed in the context of these nurtured and maintained models (Sniderman 1992:231).

We learn our conservativism or liberalism and bigotry while we are children. Each new policy we are asked to consider is judged in the context of our ideologies or prejudices: the image of the present policy offered to us will be grouped into the images we carry from childhood, and we will react to that new image based on our conditioned reactions to how things fit into our simple schema. Contrary to Converse's (1964) notion of different belief schema for the elite and for the public, others claim that the heuristics of the general public are a direct product of elite influence because the elite control public opinion through the institutions of socialization (Kuklinski and Segura 1995: 5-18).

If the elite control all opinion, then there would only be elite opinion, no belief system formation in the general public that differed from that of their leaders. There would be no need for elections since everyone would agree on the course of public policy. If the masses develop completely different belief systems from the elite, then communication between the two is nearly impossible. Instead, what is more likely is that the elite and the masses influence and are influenced by the institutions of socialization. Kuklinski and Segura suggest that public opinion is the product of both elite opinion-leading *and* separate belief formation in the mass public (1995: 18).

The heuristics utilized in modeling symbolic politics are the basis for stereotyping. A new experience is judged against a pre-existing belief, a truncated, simplified version of a unique historical reality. People use heuristics not only to simplify the complexities of political issues, but also to frame information that comes to them in the form of persuasive arguments. The easier an argument is to understand, the more closely aligned it may become with pre-existing heuristics. If adverse consequences, instead of positive outcomes, are put forth by the political elite, then this new information is more likely to be accepted into one's belief system

(Colb and Kuklinski 1997: 94, 114-115). Levels of tolerance toward a group with a negative stereotype may increase if simple arguments can be formulated and advocated by political elites that dispel that stereotype. This suggests that ridding the classroom of minority stereotypes can be accomplished simply by providing easily understood information that dilutes the stereotype.

Golebiowska (1997) found that one's tolerance for an individual depends upon how well the individual's behavior fits a stereotyped model of the group to which the individual belongs. As an example, tolerance of an individual gay male may hinge on where he falls on a scale of perceived group promiscuity or perceived group fashion sense (where the stereotype is that all gay men are promiscuous or all gay men are slaves to fashion). If one's belief system carries negative images of a particular group, and thus one is (in general) intolerant of that group, then an individual from within the target group may avoid such intolerance by appearing contradictory to the symbolic group behavior. For example, a lesbian appearing to be feminine or a gay male in a monogamous relationship are images contradictory to commonly held stereotypes and could force one to reevaluate one's belief system about homosexuals. Using tolerance levels of college students toward gay men as individuals who either fit the stereotype of gay men as a group or did not fit the group stereotype, Golebiowska found that when the appearance and behavior of an individual conform to a pre-existing negative symbolism, then the individual will experience group intolerance. However, if the individual performs outside the expected group standard, then the individual may escape the intolerance afforded the group (1997: 1013-1023).

Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus (1979) define "tolerance" as a "willingness to 'put up with' those things that one rejects ... a willingness to permit the expression of those ideas or interests that one opposes" (785). The authors found that although there have been reports of increased tolerance for the American public, this effect may be the result of researcher bias. During the 1950s through to the 1970s, most researchers studied levels of tolerance afforded specific groups (such as Communists and atheists) and found a growing tolerance for those specified groups (Sullivan et al 1979:781-785). The research did not reflect the growing number of different groups challenging the tolerance levels of the American populace. Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus suggest allowing respondents to pick their own groups to which they are opposed and then determine their levels of tolerance (1979:785). When this was done, the authors discovered that the levels of intolerance in America had not diminished. Although this method enhances study design, it may not always be practical given limitations on resources and time for conducting such research. Even though Golebiowska fails to let her respondents pick their own disliked groups, she improves upon the Sullivan, et al (1979) design by differentiating between individual-target and group-target tolerance that is not measured when respondents are only studied in relation to group tolerance.

Golebiowska (1992) advocates changing an individual's behavior to be less like that of the group in order to avoid the higher intolerance shown toward groups. This process distances the individual from the group in order for the individual to capitalize on higher tolerance levels shown for individual targets than for groups (1024). In contrast, Shane Phelan (1997) notes that as gay organizations generate tolerance for their groups, it is accomplished by distancing their

image from the heterosexually less appealing symbolisms of specific in-group minorities[3]. This creates a "cultural imperialism" where it is "through the imperialist gaze 'others' are visible as stereotypes, while their concrete and particular lives are invisible" (Phelan 1997: 3). Simply, if the elite advocate acting more like "straight" citizens to avoid the intolerance afforded the visibly gay, then the elite are not representing the majority of gay citizens who cannot or will not assimilate. This call for distancing one's self from group stereotypes does not solve the problems with intolerance, instead intolerance is supported. It cannot be said that acceptance of those who differ little from the cultural norm is an adequate measure of tolerance.

Corbett (1982) states that political tolerance has two aspects: freedom of expression and equality (3). One might experience tolerance for exercising a freedom of expression or one might experience tolerance which grants one the freedom from discrimination. Both aspects "imply a willingness to accept differences among people and to treat individuals as equal units within society" (4). Corbett found that Americans do not tolerate all groups equally, nor do those who tolerate acts of expression necessarily tolerate acts of equality or vise versa. Corbett also found that there is a direct relationship between education and tolerance (165). The more education one has, the more likely one has been exposed to democratic processes and concepts of equality which provide a foundation that allows a student to understand abstract concepts relating to tolerance of expression and equality. Corbett also suggests that education exposes a student to many different people and ideas which legitimizes the acceptance of diversity; and education enhances cognitive development which permits a level of maturity necessary for developing tolerance (165-166).

Although measuring the relationship between tolerance and education is complicated by problems[4] with selection, social desirability, and group-relatedness, Corbett still finds education to be a significant influence on the level of tolerance one displays (1982:167-174). Searching for a reason why some develop higher levels of tolerance than others, Corbett discovered that not all citizens receive the same form of civics education. Some receive only general concepts of democracy which become propaganda slogans by the time a student reaches high school, while others are given specific applications of how to apply democratic values to the acceptance of diversity (189). For increasing the understanding of democracy and how to apply such values, Corbett suggests that all students during their formal educational years should attend a class that teaches tolerance as an application of democracy.

---

[3]The marginalized members of the homosexual community are those who cannot easily assimilate to the heterosexual culture, or those who chose not to assimilate, such as the "mannish" looking women or "girlish" looking men, those who dress in extremes -- the drag queens, the leather and lace crowd or the 1950s style "butch fem" look. Phelan suggests that the elite group members want to be identified with an image that is more closely identified with being heterosexual than with the images (in reality) that match some stereotypes of homosexuals because acceptance is thought to be more easily obtained.

[4]Problems of selection stem from the likelihood that it may not be college that teaches students to be tolerant but instead it is the case that those who are more tolerant choose to attend college. Social desirability is the problem stemming from the possibility that students are responding with what they believe is the "right" answer and not in accord with their actual feelings. The problem of group-relatedness is that those who are more educated have less groups that they dislike than those with less education, even if there is no difference in the amount of tolerance reported by the more educated and the less educated (Corbett 1982: 167-174).

Because cognitive development must be reached before one can understand and is capable of tolerance, and before student values are solidified, Corbett states that this tolerance training should occur around the age of twelve (208). Unfortunately, most of those teaching formal education are themselves lacking in training or experience with teaching specific applications of tolerance. The best way to increase levels of tolerance and promote diversity, according to Corbett, is through the initiation of a "mandatory, college-level course for all teachers" so that tolerance training will find its way to the general public (209). In this way, not only are the elite responsible for influencing the mass public but also the institution of education is capable of influencing both the elite and the general population.

Tom W. Smith (1991) notes that although there have been numerous studies on changes in racial tolerance, there has been little research into the stereotypes or "ethnic images" that people hold toward minority groups (1). Smith uses the term "ethnic images" instead of "stereotypes" in order to avoid negative associations. These images are more easily understood as "beliefs that people have about cultural groups ... their members ... and group characteristics and attributes" (2).

In order to document the images people have of minorities and to determine how these images influence attitudes and behaviors toward these groups, Smith developed an instrument that uses polar statements with seven intermediate points. The respondents are asked to rate how likely minority group images (in areas of Wealth, Work Ethic, Violence, Intelligence, and Patriotism) describe those minorities (3). This instrument was included in the 1990 General Social Survey[4].

Just as Gilens (1995, 1996), and Kinder and Mendelberg (1995) found, Smith (1991) discovered that even though there are government sponsored programs (affirmative action, busing, and so on) that attempt to enhance assistance to, and the integration of, minority groups, the white population evaluates these minorities[5] negatively (4). Specifically, *minorities* were characterized as differing in a negative direction on class-related images -- taking welfare, poor, and lazy. These images of ethnic groups are strong predictors of attitudes people will have toward programs that promote integration and th. tolerance of civil rights or the expression of civil liberties by the ethnic group.

Attitudes based on stereotypes, positive or negative, of certain groups are formed through the exposure, over time to cultural norms. They are the feelings that are interrelated to the symbolic images created and perpetuated throughout childhood and into adulthood. These norms are developed and maintained through institutions of socialization, such as the family, religions, and education (see also Jones 1974, 1977; Woelfel, 1978; Travers, 1983; and McHale, 1994)[6]. Higher education, as an agent of political socialization, and noted by Corbett (1982), is an important institution in determining the course of public policy and the applied understanding of tolerance in a democracy. We also know that those with a college education are more likely

---

[4] Smith's questions have been modified from telephone use to that of self-administration for inclusion in this project. *Stereotypes, Tolerance, and the Classroom*

[5] Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians

[6] The various authors suggest that education is an important institution of socialization.

(than those without) to exercise acts of political participation that influence the actions of public actors (Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980; Verba, Schlozman, Brady, and Nie, 1993; Nagel and McNulty, 1996; and Lijphart, 1997)[8].

Stereotypes held by those with higher education are conveyed to public actors or are held by the governing elite and are reflected in public policy. With attitudes reflective of minority images held by potential voters as well as leaders playing such an important role in the formation of public policy and ultimately the character of society's democratic values, then the messages citizens receive from their socializing institutions are important. Since institutions influence human behavior, college-level class curriculum, by increasing awareness and sensitivity to minority images, can influence levels of tolerance students display and convey to others.

Many universities are interested in meeting the goals of social justice. This usually entails programs that attempt to build a more inclusive, diverse, and tolerant campus. Some schools require that all students take a class or pick one class from a list of classes that focus on an aspect of the social justice programs or on the various groups the programs target for inclusion. At West Virginia University (WVU) students are required to take one three-credit-hour course which focuses on "foreign or minority culture or cultures or on women and or issues of gender" (WVU Undergraduate Catalog 1995-97:31)[9]. By fulfilling this class requirement, are students more open to creating common ground among the many diverse groups on campus or is this focus so vague that a student can pick among the classes without challenging their prejudices?

If tolerance levels increase after attending such a class, then offering foreign minority gender classes assists a university in achieving an atmosphere of inclusion and diversity on campus. When students are not offered the opportunity to "acquire knowledge, understanding, and an appreciation of diversity in languages, cultures, ideas, and peoples," then we fail to encourage students to "accept their responsibilities as citizens of a free society" and to respect the "individuality of fellow human beings" (WVU Undergraduate Catalog 1995-97:28-29). If a class does not further the goals of the university, then the class is not an adequate choice for fulfilling such a requirement. A different, more direct approach to inclusion, diversity, tolerance, and the building of common ground may be necessary.

DESIGN

Students attending foreign minority gender classes were given a questionnaire at the start of the semester to assess their tolerance levels and the stereotypes presently held. The same students were then again surveyed at the end of the semester. The survey utilized in both pre-class and post-class settings contains questions on the following dimensions and their subdivisions to get at the socio-economic and behavioral characteristics of the target groups:

---

[8] The various authors suggest that the more education one has, the more likely one is to participate in some form of political behavior (voting, contributions, contacting public actors, etc.) than those with less education.

[9] There are 56 possible choices among the lower level cluster fulfilling classes that can be used to meet the foreign minority gender (FMG) requirement, and there are 20 upper level classes.

Wealth (rich poor), Work-Ethic (hard working lazy), Violence (not prone to prone to), Intelligence (intelligent unintelligent), Dependency (self-supporting live of welfare), and Patriotism (patriotic unpatriotic). Smith (1991) explains that Wealth is perceived as a "factual" dimension (3), and we can categorize Work-Ethic and Dependency as economic dimensions, while Violence, Intelligence, and Patriotism are social dimensions. Using a seven point scale, a respondent is asked to rate how close a group comes to a characteristic listed for that dimension. For example, the characteristics for Wealth are "rich" and "poor", a 1 is given for the extreme rate of "rich", 7 for "poor", and the number 4 signifies that a group is neither rich nor poor.

Current literature suggests that the above dimensions reflect images commonly held by and about groups in today's society. Bannai and Cohen (1985) conducted a study on the image of Asian-American high school students held by their teachers. The authors found support for the stereotype prevalent in American society which views Asians as passive and methodical. The "passive-methodical image" comes from the perception that Asian students are "quiet and unassertive, yet highly methodical and attentive to detail", they are also perceived as less capable of basic communication skills, such as making eye contact or having expressive speech (1985: 79). These images are captured in the Work-ethic and Intelligence dimensions.

In a study conducted by Wood and Chesser (1994), the authors indicate that the stereotyping of Blacks can become a measure of race relations, and that stereotyping supports discrimination against Blacks in America. Wood and Chesser document the five most common stereotypes of Blacks held by white college undergraduates over a sixty year period. From 1932 to 1993 white students characterized Blacks as "lazy" in five out of the six studies. Only in the 1970s does "lazy" drop out of the top five stereotypes (returning again in the 80s and persistent through to the present), and "aggressive" begins to appear in the list (continuing through to the 90s). Since 1982, undergraduates are more likely to negatively stereotype Blacks and, specifically, Freshmen were more likely to stereotype Blacks. The stereotypes are thought to be rooted in the student's high school education, family, and through media exposure (31-32).

Hispanic-Americans were stereotyped by whites as unintelligent, lazy, and violent in a study conducted by Melinda Jones (1991), and the National Council of La Raza states that those negative stereotypes are perpetuated by the entertainment industry, with little to no counter-balancing positive images broadcast from Hollywood (Fitzgerald 1994:11). The Jewish community receives a somewhat different treatment with stereotypes. Wilson (1996) notes that there is a growing tendency to characterize Jews as intelligent, hard working, successful and ambitious, which are seemingly benign stereotypes. Yet, Wilson found that these "positive" images were actually loosely disguised images indicating anti-Semitism[10] on the part of the respondent (465-480).

In Urvashi Vaid's book, Virtual Equality, Vaid notes that negative attitudes toward allowing Gays to teach stems from the irrationally held image of Gays as child molesters (1995 :20). This aspect of intolerance is covered in the questions which ask respondents whether they would allow a member of the target groups to teach at various levels of school. In Smith's (1991) study the Patriotism category was included to capture the traditional image of "foreignness" between and within groups. This category also has the potential to capture

---

[10] such as "hard-working" and "ambitious" really meant "controlling" and "ruthless."

attributes associated with Gays and with Women. Shilts (1993) reports in Conduct Unbecoming, that the Department of Defense declared that homosexuals could not serve in the military because this group of citizens tend to be disloyal due to their susceptibility to blackmail, and that homosexuals are disruptive to the normal workings of the military machine (378).

After the image section of the survey, a section for testing tolerance was included in this questionnaire. Respondents were asked if they would allow members of the target groups to make speeches in the respondent's community, at the local courthouse, and on campus. As pointed out by Corbett (1982), there is tolerance of expression, such as speech making, and this tolerance may depend on the actual application of where and by whom the expressions are made. Questions on speech-making and another question on removing a book written by a member of the target group from the local library were utilized on this survey in order to tap into the tolerance levels toward civil liberties of students before and after taking a FMG class. To tap into the equality aspect of tolerance, respondents were asked[11] if they would allow a member of the target groups to teach in a college or university, and a public school where their child or a relative's child attended as an indicator of civil rights tolerance.

To determine whether the subject areas covered by a class had any bearing on a student's willingness to stereotype, cross-tabulations were conducted. Each class syllabus was collected and analyzed for a "social justice statement". This is a statement that contains general declarations of adherence to tolerance, civil liberties, or civil rights, as a part of the classroom atmosphere. For example, one syllabus stated, "In recognition of the WVU community's commitment to social justice, we want to create a positive environment for learning and foster appreciation of diversity in the classroom." The syllabi were analyzed for course content that might cover issues of race, gender, and sexual orientation. For example, one syllabus contained a section titled "Education & the African-American", another syllabus contained a section titled "Heterosexism and Homophobia", and another had "Gender and Development." The syllabi were also searched for coverage of "foreignness", that is, for issues not White-American, African-American, Hispanic-American, or Asian-American. For example, one syllabus covered the topic "Latin America: agriculture, industry, informal sector, non-agricultural production."

FINDINGS

(Table 1 about here)

Table 1 indicates that students prior to taking one of the foreign, minority, or gender classes, held images of Asian-Americans that echo those found in the Bannai and Cohen (1985) study. Asian-Americans were characterized as the hardest working and the most intelligent of the groups[12]. Interestingly, Asian-Americans only rank below the mid-point in the dimension of Patriotism, appearing as the most unpatriotic of the groups in this study.

Results similar to those found by Wood and Chesser (1994) are also found in the present

---

[11] These questions are similar to those used for the Civil Liberties sections on the 1991 General Social Survey. See Appendix A for the actual questions used.

[12] Groups in this study are: Asian-Americans, Blacks, Gays, Hispanic-Americans, Jews, Men, Whites, and Women. See Appendix C Survey specifications.

study (see Table 1). Students, before taking a foreign minority gender (FMG) class, indicated that they perceived Blacks as being the most violent, lazy, and the most likely to live off of welfare. Contrary to the Wood and Chesser (1994) results, Freshman were not more likely to stereotype Blacks. The data indicate that Seniors are the most likely to negatively stereotype Blacks. Although all the respondents used in this sample self-reported no previous foreign, minority, or gender class experience, the differences in stereotyping behavior may be the result of different characteristics of the groups in the sample. Since a FMG class is required before a student can graduate, all students will attend such a class during their stay on campus. Freshman who take a FMG class may be students who have an actual interest in the subject of diversity, while Seniors who take a FMG class are most likely fulfilling those requirements and not taking the class by choice.

Table 1 shows that students ranked Hispanic-Americans as the least intelligent and second only to Blacks as the most lazy of the groups. Hispanic-Americans received the worst overall image ranking. The use of such negative images is similar to the use of those images associated with Blacks, and may have a similar affect on levels of support for public policy perceived as minority related. The data in Table 1 show that the ranked images of Jews do not fall below the mid-point in any dimension except for that of Patriotism.

In this study Gays are the least tolerated group, whether it is speaking, teaching or having a book in the library. The data indicate that 16.7% of the students would not allow someone Gay to teach at a public school that their child or a relative's child attended, and 18.6% would remove a book from the library that was written by a Gay in support of Gays. In a study by Ward (1979) which gathered common typification of homosexuals, the author states that Gays are commonly perceived as intelligent, sensitive, and artistic (417). As with the other groups, a positive stereotype may be as harmful as a negative image. Contrary to the typical image of Gays as intelligent, respondents ranked only Blacks and Hispanic-Americans lower in intelligence than Gays (see Table 1).

Table 1 shows that students ranked Whites, Men, and Women as the most Patriotic, with Asian-Americans and Hispanic-Americans as the least Patriotic. For our sample of students, Gays are ranked less Patriotic than Blacks, but more patriotic than the remaining ethnic groups. With recent military scandals[11] bringing into question the inclusion of women in the military[12], the scores in Table 1 indicate the image of Women in the Patriotism dimension has not suffered.

The data indicate that the pre-FMG-class students have self-reported very high levels of tolerance for most of the groups in most of the dimensions. Only tolerances toward Gays have a mean less than .90 (where the mean must fall between 0 for disallowing the activity and 1 for allowing the behavior).

---

[11]See Washington Post (1997) articles such as "Female Pilot asks Air Force for Honorable Discharge Instead of Trial" by Tamara Jones, or "Wrongdoing Up Command Chain" and "Verdict Deepens Divisions Over Women in Uniform" by Dana Priest.

[12]See Weak Link, Feminization of the American Military by Brian Mitchell (1989) for arguments against women serving in general. See Washington Post (1997) articles such as "Army May Restudy Mixed Sex Training" and "Verdict Deepens Divisions Over Women in Uniform" by Dana Priest for specific incidents of women in service reconsidered.

(Table 2 about here)

Using paired sample t-tests to detect changes in responses about images of Women, Minorities, and Gays, little variation was found. Reported in Table 2, significant changes occurred in the Work Ethic dimension where Whites and Women were rated more neutrally in the post-class surveys, but the image remains positively stereotyped. Hispanic-Americans were also rated more neutrally in the Violence dimension, yet this image remains negatively stereotyped. The image of Jews approached a more neutral characterization in the Dependence area, but like the other changes, the image of Jews remains positively stereotyped. The most significant changes occurring in the images held by students after attending a foreign, minority, or gender class came in the Patriotism dimension. The image of Blacks, Whites, and Women all moved toward the more neutral area of the scale, yet each fell short of any actual neutrality and remained positively stereotyped. As for tolerance levels, there were no significant changes occurring after attending a foreign, minority, or gender class.

(Table 3 about here)

Consistent with other studies (see Smith 1991, Corbett 1982), respondents in this study are willing to stereotype groups when asked. Table 3 shows the percentage of students willing to stereotype all, some, or none of the groups in each of the dimensions prior to completing a foreign, minority, or gender class. It is clear that in every dimension nearly 70% of the respondents are willing to rate a target group image in either a positive or negative direction. Running paired sample t-tests revealed no change in the willingness to stereotype of students after completing a foreign, minority, or gender class. There was a decrease in the proportion of students willing to stereotype at least one group in each dimension.

The only correlation[15] between class topic and willingness to stereotype is found in the Wealth dimension. There are some changes in the percentage of students who are willing to stereotype after attending a foreign, minority, or gender class that covers racial issues. While 14.3% were willing to stereotype all groups, and 21.4% were not willing to stereotype any group previous to attending the class, those willing to stereotype all groups dropped to only 4.2% and those not willing to stereotype any group jumped to 36.6% after completing the course. Although this seems to be a significant change, the correlation between class and willingness to stereotype is only -.210 which does not indicate a strong relationship.

Golebiowska (1997) suggested that when one's belief system carries negative imaging of a group, one is (in general) intolerant of that group (1013-1023). Since the data indicate negative stereotyping, we would expect lower tolerance levels. This is not the case with our sample of students who self-report very high levels of tolerance. This study shows high levels of tolerance for all the target groups even though there are negative images for Blacks and Hispanic-Americans. Although less tolerance is reported toward Gays which have some positive

---

[15] The only correlation found was between racial issues and the wealth dimension. Simple bivariate and multivariate regressions indicate that attending a class that covers racial issues is slightly better at explaining the change in one's willingness to stereotype than the other course content. $r^2 = .044$ racial issues ($t = -2.024$, $p < .05$), and adding each of the remaining variables (gender, social justice, gay issue, foreign issues) only improved the model to $r^2 = .049$, with the social justice statement giving no improvement the model at all. Although statistically significant, there is only a weak relationship between course content and willingness to stereotype.

rankings, there is no depiction of overt intolerance. Yet, there does seem to be some connection between tolerance levels and the level of education of the student.

Corbett (1982) suggested that the more education one had, the more likely one has been exposed to democratic processes and concepts of equality, and that education exposes students to different people and ideas which legitimize diversity and increase tolerance (165-66). In the present study Freshman have the highest self-reported levels of tolerance and Sophomores have the lowest. Seniors are the least tolerant of any group except White Men teaching at a college or in a public school. This seems to suggest that the earlier in one's college education that one takes a foreign, minority, or gender class the more likely the class is able to reinforce previously held levels of tolerance. This may also indicate that Freshman are not exposed to as many diverse groups as those who have had a year or more of college experience. Without experience with those different than themselves, Freshman responses may reflect an ideal level of tolerance that the individual student has not yet had challenged.

As the student advances through college they are exposed to more groups and they are more intimately exposed to people different from themselves, such as in the dorms and through campus events. The lowered level of tolerance found[16] among Sophomores may be the result of the turmoil many students experience during their first year on campus. It seems that completing a foreign, minority, or gender class for the first time has no significant impact on these tolerance levels. Since first time exposure has no impact, the data were analyzed for a cumulative effect. There were no significant differences between student responses of those who reported completing more than one foreign, minority, or gender class, and those who had completed only one such class. The only effect of multiple diversity classes seems to be in the area of Dependency. Hispanic-Americans were perceived somewhat less negatively by those having more than one foreign, minority, or gender class[17].

DISCUSSION

The overall images that students hold about Women, Minorities, and Gays do not change by taking foreign, minority, or gender classes. Cultural stereotypes, such as "hard-working" Jews, "intelligent" Asian-Americans, "lazy" Hispanic-Americans, and "violent" Blacks, are prominent among this sample of students. Specifically, White students entered the foreign, minority, or gender classes viewing the image of Whites as more rich, patriotic, and self-supportive than Blacks and Hispanic-Americans, and exited with similar images.

Most of the students were willing to stereotype at least one group either positively or negatively. Blacks and Hispanic-Americans received the most negative image scores in most dimensions of this study. Asian-Americans received the most positive image scores in many areas as well. In general, the stereotypes are more positive than negative, but as suggested by Wilson (1996), the benign stereotype might be as harmful as the negative stereotype. There does seem to be some indication that in-class curriculum coverage of racial issues is connected to a

---

[16]Further speculation is not possible since I do not have data on the students' class curriculum prior to attending college nor their living arrangements on campus.

[17]Unfortunately there are no data on how many classes and what type of previous classes these students have completed.

students increased unwillingness to stereotype in the Wealth dimension. Neither positive nor negative stereotyping appears to have any affect on the tolerance levels students report toward the target groups for the areas of speech-making, teaching, or being in print.

This exploration of the images students hold toward particular groups began in an attempt to capture the possible effects of attending a foreign, minority, or gender class. There appears to be little difference in the imaging students have after this type class than the imaging before such a class. Specifically, these classes do not have any significant impact on previously held stereotypes of students with or without prior foreign, minority, or gender class experience.

It should not be surprising that this study finds no change in previously held stereotypes, that levels of tolerance are so high that increases aren't detectable. The definition, a simple and easily met criterion, allowed for more than 60 sections of classes a semester to fulfil the foreign, minority, gender requirement. The classes did not fail in their mission -- for most of the classes their mission (on whole) was not to increase tolerance nor dispel stereotypes. The classes met, on some general level, the criterion for inclusion as a foreign, minority, gender class. It is the criterion that fails to initiate a path toward the goals of social justice for these classes to follow. The definition is so broad that any creative instructor could make an argument for her class to be included. Although the N is small in this particular study and limits an empirical statement of any strength, there is a general feeling emerging from the data suggesting that some classes better meet the goals of inclusion and diversity than do others. In general, those classes from the Women's Studies section covered most subject areas analyzed in the syllabi, while other courses only covered one area or only contained a social justice statement.

The students in Women's Studies classes, after completing the course, displayed a positive stereotype toward Blacks in the Intelligence dimension (while the other classes reported somewhat negative images of Blacks), and reported higher tolerances levels toward Gays in the areas of speaking in the community, teaching in public school, and having a book in the library, than those students taking non-Women's Studies oriented foreign, minority, gender classes. Women's Studies classes seem to have higher overall tolerances and less negative stereotypes than do students in the other classes. But, this seems to be the case in both pre- and post-survey responses, which reenforces the suspected notion of self-selection encourage by having such broad definitions of what makes a foreign, minority, gender class. With so many possible choices, students are able to pick among those classes that would support their previously held notions, or at least would not challenge those personal heuristics.

If this research is correct, and the array of classes that one can take to fulfill the diversity class requirement do not produce change, then curriculum reevaluation is necessary. Having many different classes to choose from may allow students to pick certain types of classes that do not challenge their belief systems or encourage them to explore cultures outside of their immediate experience, thus allowing preexisting stereotypes to continue. The more immediate implication is for policy change that reflects a more narrow definition or a detailed list of criteria that a class must meet to be included in the list of possible choices.

Thus, one method of combating this successful avoidance of diversity experience is to change the number and type of classes offered. The criteria a class must meet before becoming an accepted curriculum choice for fulfilling the foreign, minority, gender requirement could be changed to reflect a more specific focus on diversity without crossing the boundaries of faculty

freedom in course content. Another method utilized on some campuses is to have a single required class that all students must complete, similar to the requirement that all students must have an introductory English or Math class. This last method may be a more effective way of teaching tolerance as the application of democratic principles.

If a university is truly attempting to further inclusive diversity and common ground, then its curriculum used to reflect this should, in fact, reflect this. Here the research highlights the possible failure of higher education curriculum to achieve the ideal manifestation of democracy -- tolerance of difference, differences as diversity not as (thinly veiled "isms" through) stereotyping.

LIMITATIONS

As suggested by Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus (1979), the lack of tolerance variation may be the result of bias introduced into this study by selecting the eight target groups for the respondents instead of allowing the respondents to specify their own "least liked" groups (785). Another possibility is that, as noted by Corbett (1982), education not only exposes a student to different people and ideas, but also pinpoints and accentuate similarities. As students become more acclimated to the educational environment the students become more alike than different. But, differential scores (not reported here, but available from author) indicate that students do see groups different from themselves in most of the dimensions covered in this project. As noted previously, there is no background data on whether the students have had similar type diversity classes prior to entering college. There is the likelihood of social desirability and there may be some aspect of social acceptance involved. It is still possible that students gave answers not necessarily in accordance with how they felt but with their notion of what was the socially acceptable answer. If the high tolerance responses are rooted in this problem of social desirability then the effects of taking a FMG class may be masked. The survey questions may be inappropriate for tapping into the stereotypes and tolerance levels college students employ, and stereotypes of students may be different than those of the general population or those found in the literature.

As for project design, the non-FMG class instructors were not gender balanced, which limits the function of the control group. Because sampling was of convenience (i.e. those instructors willing to participate, whatever students attended class that day), the generalizability of this study is greatly hampered. The lack of effect found from attending a FMG class may hold with at least this particular sample, but nothing more is inferred (Cook and Campbell 1979:76).

The most serious problem with this study is that of testing effect[18]. The project utilized a Solomon four-group design to identify possible effects resulting from being surveyed at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester. Those who took the preclass survey rated group images (in the areas of Wealth, Work-Ethic, Dependency, and Intelligence) more neutral than those who did not and they reported more tolerance (for allowing a book in the library) than those only taking a postclass questionnaire. If students reported higher levels of tolerance and less stereotyping because they were made more aware of these issues by

---

[18]Testing effect is defined by Ethridge (1994) as the effects arising "when the measured behavior or characteristics of the subjects with respect to the dependent variable are affected by the act of measurement itself" (121).

completing a questionnaire, then the possible effect of taking a FMG class is softened or veiled by this testing effect.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Further research in this area will be necessary for supporting the findings. A larger sample of students from each kind of class that can be used to fill the foreign, minority, gender requirement would allow for testing between the classes. This would detect differences in the specific classes and help pinpoint those classes that do challenge stereotypes and those that do not. Repeating this across campuses would generate a clearer picture of the imaging, tolerance, and the effectiveness of foreign minority gender classes. By comparing the results to those campuses which require one specific diversity class to those with more general classes will help in the evaluation of which method is better for teaching tolerance. A sample with larger numbers of different racial, ethnic and sexual identities would permit more in-depth comparisons of group images in relation to the respondent.

For future research the questions on tolerance must be developed in a way that reflects issues more relevant to college students and not wrapped in the "legality" of constitutional issues. For example, instead of "would you allow a Gay to speak on Campus", a better test of tolerance might be "would you object to having a Gay roommate", or to let the respondent pick their own disliked groups "who would you object to having as a roommate." More might be learned if we were to also determine whether stereotypes and tolerance levels are correlated to policies that are of particular relevance to the student, such as "would you support university policy that required you to accept a member of (your least liked group) as a roommate." Allowing students to select their own "disliked" groups may be more fruitful for tolerance analysis. Developing an instrument with a broader range of group actions may also identify varying tolerance levels. And, of course, an instrument that does not produce testing effects must be utilized in any continuing project.

Table 1. Image of Group Characteristics By Pre-Class Students[1] in FMG Classes[2]. Rank[3] Among Groups for each Dimension by Mean.

Group	Wealth rich/poor (rank) x̄	Work-ethic hard/lazy (rank) x̄	Violence not prone /prone (rank) x̄	Intelligence intelligent/ unintelligent (rank) x̄	Dependency selfsupport/ welfare (rank) x̄	Patriotism patriotic/ unpatriotic (rank) x̄	Overall (rank) x̄[4]
Asian-Americans	(4) 3 54 N=102	(1) 2 84 N=101	***(3) 3 59 N=102	(1) 2 72 N=101	++(4) 3 10 N=102	(8) 3 93 N=102	(1) 2 95 N=101 6
Blacks	(7) 4 35 N=102	(8) 3 84 N=101	(8) 4 95 N=102	(7) 3 69 N=101	(8) 4 27 N=102	(4) 3 64 N=102	(7) 4 12 N=101 6
Gays	(6) 3 84 N=101	**(6) 3 69 N=102	(2) 3 51 N=102	(6) 3 37 N=102	(5) 3 22 N=102	(5) 3 68 N=101	(6) 3 55 N=101 6
Hispanic-Americans	(8) 4 67 N=103	(7) 3 79 N=102	(6) 4 67 N=102	(8) 3 95 N=101	(7) 4 22 N=102	(7) 3 92 N=101	(8) 4 20 N=101 8
Jews	(2) 3 17 N=103	(5) 3 05 N=102	(4) 3 73 N=100	(3) 3 08 N=101	(1) 2 88 N=101	(6) 3 88 N=102	(3) 3 30 N=101 5
Men	*(3) 3 22 N=103	(2) 2 96 N=102	(7) 4 81 N=102	(4) 3 09 N=102	(2) 2 95 N=102	(2) 2 92 N=101	(5) 3 33 N=102
White	(1) 3 06 N=103	(3) 3 01 N=102	(5) 4 04 N=102	+(2) 3 01 N=102	(3) 3 05 N=102	(1) 2 85 N=102	(2) 3 17 N=102 2
Women	(5) 3 77 N=103	(4) 3 02 N=102	(1) 3 31 N=102	(5) 3 11 N=102	(6) 3 41 N=102	+++(3) 3 23 N=102	(4) 3 31 N=102 2

1. The respondents are Caucasian students with no previous foreign, minority, or gender class experience, who participated in both pre- and post-class surveys.

2. The respondents were instructed. The following are some questions about different groups in our society. Please rate the various characteristics on a seven point scale. For example, in the first question a score of 1 means you think almost all of the people in that group are "rich". A score of 7 means you think almost all of the people in that group are "poor". A score of 4 means you think that the group rate is not towards one end or another. Please pick any of the numbers that comes closest to where you think people in that group stand.

3. The rankings shown in parentheses were generated by assigning numbers chronologically, starting with the mean closest to the positive area of the scale and moving to the mean farthest from the positive score.

4. This column was calculated by averaging the N and averaging the means.

*Significant difference between first and third rank at .01, t=3.599 (significant difference between remaining ranks at .000).

**Significant difference between first and sixth rank at .000, t=6.242 (significant difference between remaining ranks at .000).

***Significant difference between first and third rank at .031, t=2.187 (significant difference between remaining ranks at .000).

+Significant difference between first and second rank at .018, t=2.399 (significant difference between remaining ranks at .000).

++Significant difference between first and forth rank at .037, t=2.114 (significant difference between remaining ranks at .000).

+++Significant difference between first and third rank at .000, t=4.942 (significant difference between remaining ranks at .000).

Table 2. Significant Change in Imaging after Attending a Foreign/Minority/Gender Class.

Dimension	Group	Preclass $\bar{x}$	Postclass $\bar{x}$	T	Significance	N	Image (+improve/-decline)
Work Ethic (hard/lazy)	Whites	3 01	3 24	-2 321	040	102	- (approaches neutral)
	Women	3 02	3 25	-2 081	022	102	-(approaches neutral)
Violence (not prone/prone)	Hispanic-Americans	4 69	4 44	2 024	046	102	+(approaches neutral)
Dependence (self-support/welfare)	Jews	2 88	3 18	-2 259	026	101	-(approaches neutral)
Patriotism (patriotic/unpatriotic)	Blacks	3 64	3 86	-1 999	048	102	-(approaches neutral)
	Men	2 92	3 14	-2 634	010	101	-(approaches neutral)
	Whites	2 85	2 93	-2 009	047	102	-(approaches neutral)

Respondents are Caucasian students with no previous foreign, minority, or gender class experience who participated in both pre- and post-class surveys. Changes represent movement toward a more neutral image.

Table 3. Preclass Students Willing to Stereotype Groups.

Dimension	% Not willing to Stereotype Any Group	% Willing to Stereotype Some Groups	% Willing to Stereotype All Groups	Total % Willing to Stereotype At Least One Group
Wealth	19.3	71.7	9.0	80.7
Work Ethic	20.2	56.0	23.8	79.8
Violence	19.0	63.8	17.2	81.0
Intelligence	22.0	47.0	31.0	78.0
Dependency	22.3	56.6	21.1	77.7
Patriotism	30.1	49.4	20.5	69.9

REFERENCES

Bannai, Hideko and David A. Cohen. 1985. *The Passive-Methodical Image of Asian American Students in the School System.* Social Science Review 70(1): 79-81.

Cobb, Michael D. and James H. Kuklinski. 1997. *Changing Minds: Political Arguments and Political Persuasion.* American Journal of Political Science. 41:88-121.

Converse, Philip E. 1964. *The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics.* In David E. Apter (ed.), Ideology and Discontent, Free Press. pp. 206-261.

Ethridge, Marcus E. 1994. The Political Research Experience: Readings and Analysis. Conn: Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Fitzgerald, Mark. *State of Hispanic America.* Editor&Publisher. Aug. 6, 1994.

Gilens, Martin. 1996. *"Race Coding" and White Opposition to Welfare.* American Political Science Review. 90(3) September 593-604.

---------- 1995. *Racial Attitudes and Opposition to Welfare.* Journal of Politicals. 57(4) November. 994-1014.

Golebiowska, Ewa A. 1997. *The "Pictures in Our Heads" and Individual-Targeted Tolerance.* Journal of Politics. 58:1010-1034.

Jones, Ruth S. 1977. *Institutional Change and Socialization Research: The School and Politicization.* Youth and Society, 8(3), March, 277-298.

---------- 1974. *Changing Student Attitudes: The Impact of Community Participation.* Social Science Quarterly, 55(2), September, 439-450.

Jones, Melinda. 1991. *Stereotyping Hispanics and Whites: Perceived Differences in Social Roles as a Determinant of Ethnic Stereotypes.* Journal of Social Psychology. 131(4): 469-477.

Jones, Tamara. "Female Pilot Asks Air Force for Honorable Discharge Instead of Trial". Washington Post, 18 May 1997, sec.A.

Kuklinski, James H. and Gary M. Segura. 1995. *Endogeneity, Exogeneity, Time, and Space in Political Representation.* Legislative Studies Quarterly. 20:3-22.

Lijphart, Arend. 1997. *"Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma".* American Political Science Review. 9-14.

McHale, Maureen T. 1994. *The Impact of College on Students' Attitudes Toward Women's Roles.* ASHE Annual Meeting Paper, November 1994.

Mitchell, Brian P. 1989. Weak Link. New York: Kampmann & Company, Inc.

Nagel, Jack H. and John E. McNulty. 1996. *"Partisan Effects of Voter Turnout in Senatorial and Gubernatorial Elections"*. American Political Science Review. 90:780-793.

Phelan, Shane. 1997. *Public Discourse and the Closeting of Butch Lesbians*. Paper at the American Political Science Association Conference, Aug. 26-31, 1997, Washington, DC.

Priest, Dana. "Wrongdoing Up Command Chain; Army Women Say Superiors Fail to Combat Harassment." Washington Post, 11 January 1997, sec.A.

---------- "Army May Restudy Mixed-Sex Training; Chief of Staff Suggests It's Time to Weigh Benefits, Drawbacks." Washington Post, 5 February 1997, sec.A.

---------- "Verdict Deepens Divisions Over Women in Uniform." Washington Post, 30 April, sec.A.

Shilts, Randy. 1993. Conduct Unbecoming: Lesbians and Gays in the U.S. Military. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Sniderman, Paul. 1992. *The New Look in Public Opinion Research*. Ch. 9 in Finifter, Ada (ed.), The State of the Discipline II. Washington, DC: APSA

Smith, Tom W. 1991. Ethnic Images. (GSS Topical Report No. 19) University of Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. Http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/GSS/report/t-report/topic19.htm.

Sullivan, John L., James Piereson, and George E. Marcus. 1979. *An Alternative Conceptualization of Political Tolerance: Illusory Increases 1950s - 1970s*. American Political Science Review. 73: 781-794.

Travers, Eva F. 1983. *The Role of School in Political Socialization Reconsidered: Evidence from 1970 and 1979*. Youth and Society, 14(4), June, 475-500.

Vaid, Urvashi. 1995. Virtual Equality. New York: Doubleday.

Verba, Schlozman, Brady, and Nie. 1993. *"Citizen Activity: Who Participates? What Do They Say?"* American Political Science Review. 87:303-318.

Ward, Russell A. 1979. *Typifications of Homosexuals*. Sociological Quarterly. 20:411-423.

West Virginia University Tables. 1995. *Enrollment by Race, Status, Level, and Gender, Fall 1995*. Http://www.wvu.edu/~inanyl/fact96/5-996.htm, June 4, 1998.

---------- 1995. Instructional Full-time Faculty by Race, Gender, and Disability Status, 1995-96. Http://www.wvu.edu/~inanyl/fact96/36-996.htm.

West Virginia University Undergraduate Catalog 1995-97

Wilson, Thomas C. 1996. *Compliments Will Get You Nowhere: Benign Stereotypes, Prejudice and Anti-Semitism*. Sociological Quarterly. 37(3): 465-480.

Woelfel, John C. 1978. *Political Attitudes: Interpersonal Sources for White, American Youth*. Youth and Society, 9(4), June, 433-452.

Wolfinger, Raymond E. and Steven J. Rosenstone. 1980. Who Votes? Yale University Press.

Wood, Peter B., and Michele Chesser. 1994. *Black Stereotyping in a University Population.* Sociological Focus. 27(1): 17-34

APPENDIXES

Appendix A Student Cover Letter, Student Questionnaire, Instructor Cover Letter

Appendix B Foreign/Minority/Gender classes and Non-foreign/Minority/Gender classes

Appendix C Project Specifications, Survey Specifications, Demographics

APPENDIX A

Dear Students:

*If you are **not** 18 years old or older, please place an X in the right hand corner of the attached questionnaire and stop there. Do not complete the form. I am only permitted to survey those who are 18 years or older.*

My name is XXXXXXXXXX, a XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX in the political science department of West Virginia University. I am interested in researching the opinions of college students XXXXXXXXXX. Your answers will enhance my understanding of student opinions.

Your answers are completely confidential and your participation is voluntary.

In order to track the data, please place the following eight digit code in the right hand corner of your survey: the last four digits of your phone number and the last four digits of your student number. If your phone number was 555-1212, then the first four digits would be 1212. If your student number was 111-22-3333, then the last four digits would be 3333. At the top of your survey you would put 1212-3333.

Your answers are confidential. This eight digit code is for tracking data; it is not for identifying an individual. Your name will not appear in any form or report, and your choice whether or not to participate will not in any way affect your grade in this class or your standing with the university. I appreciate your participation. Thank you.

Questions about this survey are directed to XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXXXXXX, Political Science Department, 293-3811 x5284.

(The survey actually appears on two 8x14 sheets of paper.)

Have you already completed this survey in another class this week? __Yes(0) __No(1)

Group Characteristics:

The following are some questions about different groups in our society. Please rate the various characteristics on a seven point scale. For example, in the first question a score of 1 means you think almost all of the people in that groups are "rich". A score of 7 means you think almost all of the people in that group are "poor". A score of 4 means you think that the group rate is not towards one end or another. Please pick any of the numbers that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

In general, how would you rate each of the following groups on the following characteristics:

I.A.	Rich			Neither			Poor
Asian Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Blacks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gays	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hispanic Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Men	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Whites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Women	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I.B.	Hard-working			Neither			Lazy
Asian Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Blacks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gays	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hispanic Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Men	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Whites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Women	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I.C.	Not Prone violence			Neither			Prone to violence
Asian Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Blacks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gays	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hispanic Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Men	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Whites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Women	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I.D.	Intelligent			Neither			Unintelligent
Asian Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Blacks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gays	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hispanic Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Men	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Whites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Women	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.E.	Self supporting			Neither			Live off welfare
Asian Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Blacks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gays	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hispanic Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Men	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Whites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Women	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1.F.	Patriotic			Neither			Unpatriotic
Asian Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Blacks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gays	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hispanic Americans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Jews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Men	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Whites	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Women	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group Actions:

2.A. Suppose a member of one of the following groups wanted to make a speech in support of their group in your community. Should that member be allowed to speak or not? (Place a check next to your answer in the space " " provided.)

Asian Americans	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Blacks	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Gays	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Hispanic Americans	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Jews	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Men	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Whites	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Women	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__

2.B. What if the speech was to be made at the courthouse steps?

Asian Americans	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Blacks	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Gays	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Hispanic Americans	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Jews	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Men	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Whites	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Women	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__

2.C. What if the speech was to be made on campus?

Asian Americans	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Blacks	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Gays	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Hispanic Americans	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Jews	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__

Men	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Whites	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__
Women	Allowed to speak(1)__	Not allowed to speak(0)__

2.D. Should a member of one of the following groups be allowed to teach in a college or university?

Asian Americans	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Blacks	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Gays	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Hispanic Americans	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Jews	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Men	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Whites	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Women	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__

2.E. Should they be allowed to teach in a public school that either your child or a relative's child attended?

Asian Americans	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Blacks	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Gays	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Hispanic Americans	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Jews	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Men	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Whites	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__
Women	Allowed to teach(1)__	Not allowed to teach(0)__

2.F. If a member of one of the following groups wrote a book in favor of their particular group, would you favor removing this book from your local public library?

Asian Americans	Favor removal(0)__	Not favor removal(1)__
Blacks	Favor removal(0)__	Not favor removal(1)__
Gays	Favor removal(0)__	Not favor removal(1)__
Hispanic Americans	Favor removal(0)__	Not favor removal(1)__
Jews	Favor removal(0)__	Not favor removal(1)__
Men	Favor removal(0)__	Not favor removal(1)__
Whites	Favor removal(0)__	Not favor removal(1)__
Women	Favor removal(0)__	Not favor removal(1)__

Demographics:

3. Are you female or male? ___F(1) ___M(2)

4. How old were you on your last birthday? _____

5. What is your current state of residence? _____

6. Of what race or ethnic group do you consider yourself? _____

7. Are you __Currently married(1) __Separated(2) __Divorced(3) __Widowed(4) __Never married(5)
__Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship but not legally married(6)

8. What is your current class rank? __Freshman(1) __Sophomore(2) __Junior(3) __Senior(4)
__Graduate(5) __Other(6)

9. Have you previously completed a class that meets the foreign/minority/gender requirements? __Yes(1) __No(0)

10.A. Is this class (the one you are in right now) one that meets the foreign/minority/gender requirement? __Yes(1)__No(0)

B. If yes, are you taking this class because it meets the foreign/minority/gender requirement? __Yes(1) __No(0)

Instructor Cover Letter:

My name is XXXXXXXXXX, a XXXXXXXXXX in the Political Science Department of West Virginia University and I am asking for a class syllabus from each class instructor whose class participates in this study. I am interested in researching the opinions of college students XXXXXXXXXX. I will look at course syllabi to enhance may understanding of student opinion formation. Your individual syllabus will be kept confidential and your participation in this study is voluntary. Your name will not appear in any form or report, and your choice whether or not to participate will not in any way affect your standing with the University. I appreciate your participation. Thank you. Questions about this study are directed to XXXXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXXXX, Political Science Department, 293-3811 x5284.

APPENDIX B

Foreign/Minority/Gender:

Of the 76 possible classes offered at WVU that meet this requirement, 63 sections for 28 types of classes were offered during the Spring semester of 1998. These classes appear in the following disciplines:

Communication
English
Foreign Literature in Translation
Geography
History
Multi-disciplinary Studies
Political Science
Sociology and Anthropology
Social Work
Technology and Education
Women's Studies

Of these types of classes, those sections with 40 or more registered students were separated from those with less than 40 students registered for the class. If a group of classes did not have one section with 40 students, the class with the most students registered was selected for surveying and another class was added to this total. Eleven classes were selected for this project, one from each group. The Technology and Education class is also listed as a Women's Study class, so an extra Women's Study class was also included.

Non-foreign/Minority/Gender:

Of the many classes offered at WVU, selecting general classes that fulfill core requirements other than that of foreign/minority/gender seemed the most practical. Of the Introductory classes in Math, English, Political Science, and Sociology, only Sociology and Political Science gave permission for conducting surveys of their students.

APPENDIX C

THE PROJECT

This study surveyed the images students had of Women, Minorities, and Gays before taking a foreign/minority/gender (FMG) class, and compared differences in those images after completing the class. There were 28 types of classes, with 63 sections, offered for the 1998 Spring semester that could be taken to fulfill the FMG requirement. Of those classes, only those with an enrollment of 40 or more students, meeting Monday through Friday were chosen. This generated 16 possible classes for inclusion in the study. Eleven instructors agreed to participate in this project. A class syllabus was collected from each of the instructors so that content analysis could be performed. One additional FMG and one non-FMG class were included in the post-class survey batch.

Pre-class and post-class surveys[19] of student attitudes toward images of gender (Women and men), minorities (Asian-American, Black, Jews, and Hispanic-American), and Whites, and sexual minorities (Gay-men, Lesbians, and Bisexuals falling under the label 'Gay') were administered to those attending a FMG class[20] (n=315). To examine the possibility of self-selection among the respondents, questionnaires were administered to students taking classes that do not meet the FMG qualifications (n=215). Following a basic Solomon four-group[21] design to detect the possible effects of testing, a FMG class and a non-FMG which did not receive a pre-class survey were added to those receiving the post-class survey (total post-class n=669; FMG n=251, non-FMG n=185; receiving only post-class n=233). For issues of regulation, Human Subjects exemption was received for this study December 2, 1997.

During the first ten days of classes for the 1998 Spring semester, the pre-class survey was administered (by the principal investigator and trained assistants) to those attending classes. Each respondent was instructed to place an eight digit code on their individual survey. The code consisted of the last four digits of their phone number and the last four digits of their student number. The respondents were informed that there would be no breach of confidentiality and that the eight digit code was only for tracking data and not for identifying the individual. A cover letter[22] was given (by the principal investigator) to the instructors, explaining the request for their syllabus. A cover letter[23] appeared at the beginning of each questionnaire, and was read out loud to the student respondents by the survey administrator. The respondents that asked for clarification or definition of terms appearing in the questionnaire (such as "prone" and "ethic") were answered with "whatever that term means to you". Those respondents during the follow-up survey that stated they had answered this questionnaire before were told to respond to the questions in accordance with their opinion "today". The respondents were not told that I was looking for a change in their opinions about images of minorities, women, and gays.

THE SURVEY

Borrowing from Smith (1991), a seven point scale is utilized, where 1 corresponds with a positive image, 4 with a neutral image, and a 7 corresponds with a negative image. This was done in order to avoid

---

[19] See appendix A for questionnaire

[20] See Appendix B for types of classes fulfilling the core requirement of a foreign minority gender class, and for types of classes used that do not meet the foreign minority gender requirements

[21] Solomon four-group design has two experimental groups (those who will be taking the FMG classes and one group will not receive the preclass survey), and two control groups (those who will be taking the non-FMG classes and one of which will not receive the preclass survey). For a more detailed discussion of this design see Ethridge (1994).

[22] See Appendix A for instructor cover letter

[23] See Appendix A for student cover letter

offending respondents, to encourage responses, to gather positive as well as negative attributes, and to compare across and within groups (2). To deal with the problems of social desirability and self-presentation, Smith suggests avoiding declarative statements because such statements tend to offend respondents and reduce the likelihood of reporting differences with such statements. The questions used in this survey of images are similar to those used by Smith where the respondent is asked to rate various groups on various characteristics. The groups used for this project are: Asian-Americans, Blacks, Gays, Hispanic-Americans, Jews, Men, Whites, and Women. This array of groups was chosen because of its ability to cover the larger segments of society and it is somewhat reflective of the student population at WVU[24]. Although it is ideal to have more groups (such as American Indians, Appalachians, Disabled Americans, etc.) involved in this study, for time and expense as well as to guard against respondent fatigue, the number of groups was limited to those eight previously mentioned.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The sample gathered for pre-class survey administration, n=530, contained no significant differences in responses between those taking a FMG class and those taking a non-FMG class[25]. Of the total number of merged respondents, n=305, there are 190 FMG respondents and 115 non-FMG respondents. Nearly 60% of the FMG students report they have not previously completed a class that meets the foreign minority gender requirements. About 50% of the non-FMG students report no previous completion of a FMG class. By controlling for previous FMG experience and only looking at those who are taking this type of class for the first time the size of the sample was reduced to N=103.

Demographically, 94.2% of the students are between 18 and 24 years old. Females make up 55% of the sample, and all of the students in this smaller sample are white. There are no significant demographic differences between those without previous FMG experience taking this type class for the first time and those without previous experience taking a non-FMG class.

---

[24]Nearly 90% of the students are White, 3.2% are Black, and Asians are almost 2% of the student body, the rest of the racial divisions are less than 1% a piece of the campus. Males make up 49.9% and Females 50.1% of the WVU campus (Enrollment by Race, Status, Level, and Gender Fall 1995 http://www.wvu.edu/~inanyl/fact96/5-996.htm, June 4, 1998). The percentages are somewhat different for faculty. Asians are 6.9%, Blacks are 2%, Hispanic are 1.6% while the other 89.1% of the faculty are White. There is a 3 to 1 ratio of male to female faculty (Instructional Full-time Faculty by Race, Gender, and Disability Status, 1995-96. Http://www.wvu.edu/~inanyl/fact96/36-996.htm, June 4, 1998)

[25]There was a significant difference between sex of instructors, where 100% of the non-FMG instructors were male and only 30.5% of the FMG instructors were male.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE